



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,705	08/08/2006	Markus Weinlander	2003P18371WOUS	2427

22116 7590 08/03/2009
SIEMENS CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH
ISELIN, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

STITT, ERIK V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/03/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/588,705	Applicant(s) WEINLANDER, MARKUS	
	Examiner Erik V. Stitt	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13, 16-25 and 27-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13, 16-25 and 27-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on August 08, 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAIL ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the Amendment, filed February 24, 2009
2. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 7, 12, 17 are independent claims. In the instant Amendment, claims 1-20 were amended. This action is made Final.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. Claims 13, 16-25, 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over San Andres et al (“San Andres”, US 2002/0124082) in view of Russell et al. (“Russell”, US 7, 076, 784).

Claim 13:

San Andres discloses a first and a second application wherein the first application is selectively launched by a user to process a folder property (*figure 3 shows a hierarchical resource explorer that allows a user to navigate different applications, further, the application launcher icons are contained within a folder (i.e., a folder property) of the*

Art Unit: 2174

folder, further, the hierarchy can represent different on-line services or other content entities [abstract]

San Andres discloses a folder associated with the property to be processed by the first application when the first application is launched by the user *(each hierarchical folder node (i.e., each application represented by a node) has a set of properties that are used to launch the particular application service for example [0008])* a folder icon representing the folder property to be processed by the first application when the first application is launched by the user

San Andres discloses a folder icon displayed via the display mechanism *(figure 3 shows how each folder node (i.e., each application represented by a node) has an icon)* a first application link linked to the first application *(figure 3 shows how each application has a root node link that links to that folder (i.e., the root node links to the properties and content for that particular application))* the link displayed via the display mechanism *(figure 3 shows how the root node link is displayed for each application)*

San Andres further discloses an object having an object property processed by the second application *(folders have content objects [0084])* an object icon representing the object and displayed via the display mechanism *(content objects of a folder have an icon [0084])* a second application link linked to the second application, the link displayed via the display mechanism *(figure 3 shows how each application has a root node link that*

Art Unit: 2174

links to that folder (i.e., the root node links to the properties and content for that particular application)) and a folder selection mechanism for displaying a content of the folder (figure 3 shows how each folder node (i.e., each application represented by a node) has a icon)

San Andres shows iconic applications [figure 3]. San Andres does not explicitly disclose that the first application is launched by the user to process the folder property displayed in the folder icon via the first application link. However, Russel is analogous art that also discloses a hierarchical object repository [figure 15]. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine San Andres with Russel, because Russel discloses how a first application can represent objects in a hierarchical tree "Sample Bank" [figure 15], and how those objects can have object properties (i.e., the components the package contains) [figure 16], and how the user can launch a package wizard application (i.e., a second application) to add sub-nodes to the tree [figure 17], and [figure 22] shows how various account properties can be edited in a second application dialog.

The modified San Andres discloses that the second application is selected via the second application link (*figure 3 shows how each application has a root node link that links to that folder (i.e., the root node links to the properties and content for that particular application)* and wherein the folder includes an element selected from the group consisting of a further folder, the object, and combinations thereof (*folders have content objects [0084]*)

Claim 16:

The modified San Andres discloses that structured data is structured in the form of a tree structure (*figure 3 shows a hierarchical tree*)

Claim 17:

The modified San Andres discloses that a display of the first application link is displayed on a same logical level as the folder icon (*figure 3 shows how the content link is displayed with an icon and the name of the folder*)

Claim 18:

The modified San Andres discloses that the display of first application link includes an icon (*figure 3 shows how the content link is displayed with an icon and the name of the folder*)

Claim 19:

The modified San Andres discloses a display of the first application link is included in the display of the folder content (*figure 3 shows how the name of the selected application folder is displayed along with the contents of the folder (e.g., Categories (US))*)

Claim 20 is similar in scope to claim 15, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 21:

Art Unit: 2174

The modified San Andres discloses a selection mechanism; and a textual information for the first application, wherein the textual information is displayed when the selection mechanism is in a proximity of the first link (*figure 3 shows how the name of the selected application folder is displayed along with the contents of the folder (e.g., Categories (US) when the user selects the folder (i.e., is in a proximity to the folder))*)

Claim 22:

The modified San Andres discloses that the textual information is dependent on the position of a display element positioned on a display area of the display mechanism (*figure 3 shows how the name of the selected application folder is displayed along with the contents of the folder (e.g., Categories (US) when the user selects the folder (i.e., is in a proximity to the folder))*)

Claim 23 is similar in scope to claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 24-25 are similar in scope to claims 16-17, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 27-29 are similar in scope to claims 21-22, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

6. Claims 14, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over San Andres et al (“Andres”, US 2002/0124082) in view of Russell et al. (“Russell”, US 7, 076, 784) in further view of Yeung et al. (“Yeung”, 7, 171, 468).

Claim 14:

The modified San Andres discloses that each folder node has a set of folder properties (e.g., each node can have a property that is used to launch components for that application) [0008], and using the Windows Explorer to access the hierarchical content [0080]. The modified San Andres does not explicitly disclose that the folder properties are copyable. However, Yeung is analogous art that also describes using the Windows Explorer to access hierarchical content [figure 18]. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the modified San Andres with Yeung, because Yeung discloses that the Windows Explorer allows a user to select and copy a folder [Col 4 57-58] so that a user can paste the item to an alternate location using the cut-and-paste tools [figure 60].

Claim 26 is similar in scope to claim 14, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

7. Claims 15, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over San Andres et al (“Andres”, US 2002/0124082) in view of Russell et al. (“Russell”, US 7, 076, 784) in further view of Gilkas et al. (“Gilkas”, 7, 017, 121).

Claim 15:

Art Unit: 2174

The modified San Andres discloses using the Windows 95 Explorer [0080]. The modified San Andres does not explicitly disclose that the element is generated during the configuration of an industrial automation system. However, Windows is a widely known operating system that can be used in a variety of industries, and elements within the Windows Explorer hierarchical tree can be applications corresponding to a variety of industries. Gilkas is analogous art that also describes using a hierarchical tree in the Windows 95 Explorer [Col 4 49-52]. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the modified San Andres with Gilkas, because Gilkas discloses that hierarchical trees like Windows Explorer can be used in an industrial automation system [Col 1 7-10], because industrial automation applications have specific software components that need to be organized [Col 1 44-46].

Claim 30 is similar in scope to claim 15, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments, with respect to the amendment filed on May 15, 2009, with respect to claims 13, 16-25, 27-29 have been fully considered, and are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

The examiner fails to see how the applicant's claimed invention distinguishes over the very well known Windows hierarchical "Windows Explorer". Nevertheless, the examiner changes the grounds of rejection in view of two references concerning the Windows Explorer that are directed towards the applicant's arguments.

The examiner sees the applicant's drawings look very similar to object repository software (as show in ("Russell", US 7, 076, 784)). It looks like the first application is an object repository (as disclosed in San Andres and Russell), and the second application is an application to edit the properties of the object in the repository (as disclosed in Russell).

The examiner is always available for interviews.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2174

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Erik V. Stitt whose telephone number is (571)270-5064. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 9:00 AM - 7:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dennis Chow can be reached on (571) 272-7767. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

EVS

July 21, 2009

Peng Ke

/Peng Ke/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174